



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,259	04/24/2006	Gisela Meister	MEIS3002/JEK	4669
23364 7590 03/02/2010 BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176				
EXAMINER				
DOAN, TRANG T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2431				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/02/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,259

Applicant(s)

MEISTER ET AL.

Examiner

TRANG DOAN

Art Unit

2431

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 12/1/2009.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending for consideration.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Russo et al. (Pub. No. 20030101348) (hereinafter Russo).
6. Regarding claims 1 and 10, Russo discloses a method for effecting a secure electronic transaction on a terminal using a portable data carrier arranged to perform different quality user authentication methods, wherein the portable data carrier performs a user authentication method, the portable data carrier confirms the proof of authentication to the terminal, and the portable data carrier then performs a security-

establishing operation within the electronic transaction, comprising the step of creating quality information by the portable data carrier about said user authentication method used and attaching said authentication quality information to the result of the security-establishing operation, wherein the difference in quality of user authentication varies between an inherently relatively lower quality and an inherently relatively higher quality from a security perspective (Russo: paragraph 0046: Token includes trust metric. The trust metric has three possible values (i.e., low, medium, and high confidence); paragraph 0053: token also includes a digital signature; and paragraphs 0058-0060: if the signature verification succeeds, then the server determines its confidence in the transaction).

7. Regarding claim 2 and 11, Russo discloses wherein the security-establishing operation performed by the portable data carrier comprises creating a digital signature (Russo: paragraph 0024: token...comprising an envelope and a seal. The envelope comprises...a trust metric. The seal contains a digital signature).

8. Regarding claim 3, Russo discloses wherein the authentication of the user is performed by presentation of a biometric feature (Russo: paragraph 0051: biometric such as fingerprint, voiceprint, or face recognition).

9. Regarding claim 4, Russo discloses wherein the authentication of the user is performed by presentation of a physiological or behavior-based feature characteristic of a user (Russo: paragraph 0051: biometric such as fingerprint, voiceprint, or face recognition).

10. Regarding claim 5, Russo discloses wherein the authentication of the user is performed by proof of knowledge of a secret (Russo: paragraph 0039: a secret...such as a private key or password).
11. Regarding claims 6 and 12, Russo discloses wherein at least two different authentication methods of different quality are offered for authentication of the user (Russo: paragraph 0051: low confidence level is assigned to authentication using a PIN or password...an authentication trust metric indicating a high confidence level is assigned authentication requiring use of a biometric).
12. Regarding claim 8, discloses wherein no quality information is produced for an authentication method (Russo: paragraph 0059: no confidence in the authenticity of the associated transaction).
13. Regarding claims 9 and 13, discloses wherein a user is asked to select an authentication method (Russo: paragraph 0044).
14. Regarding claim 14, discloses a system for effecting a secure electronic transaction within which the quality of authentication of a user of the system is ascertained, comprising a portable data carrier according to claim 10 and a terminal according to claim 13 (Russo: paragraph 0051: a physical token such as...smart card).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo in view of Miyashita (US 7403765) (hereinafter Miyashita).

17. Regarding claim 7, Russo does not disclose wherein the particular authentication methods not used are disabled. However, Miyashita discloses wherein the particular authentication methods not used are disabled (Miyashita: see figure 1, item S301; and column 5 lines 40-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled art at the time the invention was made to have included in Russo the feature of Miyashita as discussed above because the plural authenticating means of the PIN input authentication and the fingerprint authentication can be used in combination, so that plural security levels can be implemented by combining the plural authenticating means (Miyashita: column 6, lines 40-45).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRANG DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0740. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Trang Doan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431
/Syed Zia/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431